112 102

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Single Bench : Hon'ble Shri H.L. Dattu, CJ.

Contempt Petition No. 71 OF 2005.

Petitioners

1. Ku. Manju Patel, D/o. Shri B.L. Patel, Aged about 33 years, R/o. Pujari Nagar, Near Marvadi Kabristan, Nehru Nagar Ward, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Smt. Geeta Deshmukh, W/o. Shri Birendra Deshmukh, Aged about 27 years, R/o. village Bhedsar, Distt. Durg (C.G.)
3. Ku. Savita Thakur, D/o. Shri M.S. Ram, Aged about 28 years, R/o. Adarsh School Colony, Farasgaon, Bastar (C.G.)

Vs.

Respondent

Pramod Singh, Joint Director & Superintendent, Bhim Rao Ambedkar Smriti Hospital, Raipur (C.G.)

Application for initiating contempt on the respondent & to punish him for commission of willful contempt of the orders of the Court.

Present: Shri Kishore Bhaduri, counsel for the petitioners.
Shri Utkarsh Verma, Dy. G.A. for the respondent.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 10th April, 2007)

Writ petitioners in writ petition No.2495 of 2005 are the complainants in this contempt petition. They are of the view that, the respondent in this contempt petition has disobeyed the orders and directions issued by this Court on 17.06.2005, therefore, they are before me in this contempt petition with a request to initiate appropriate contempt proceedings against the respondent and punish him for his willful and deliberate disobedience to the orders and directions issued by this Court.

(2) Notice has been issued and served on the respondent and he has filed the counter affidavit. In the said affidavit, it is stated that respondent has complied with the orders and directions issued by this Court. Therefore, he has requested to drop the proceedings against him.

(3) This Court while entertaining the writ petition by its order dated 17.06.2005 has passed the following interim order:

> " In the meanwhile the services of the petitioners will not be dispensed with on expiry of the contract period, if their services have been otherwise found to be satisfactory."

(4) The petitioners are of the view that in between 17.06.2005 and 01.07.2005 the non-applicant/respondent did not permit the petitioners to continue to work as nurses in their respective hospitals. On the other hand, the respondent has stated on his counter affidavit that after receiving the order passed by this Court and after understanding the purport of the order, the respondent has permitted the petitioners to work as nurses from 01.07.2005.

(5) Having gone through the pleadings of the petitioners as well as the counter affidavit filed by the respondent as also the orders passed by this Court, I am of the opinion that the respondent has not disobeyed the orders and directions issued by this Court deliberately and wilfully. In the present scenario , I am of the opinion that cognizance to the contempt petition need not be taken by me. Accordingly, the contempt petition is rejected. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
Chief Justice